m-f

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/679,529	10/06/2003	Jeffrey Wilson	930028-2002	3965

20999 7590 09/07/2006

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG
745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL.
NEW YORK, NY 10151

EXAMINER	
SANTIAGO CORDERO, MARIVELISSE	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2617	

DATE MAILED: 09/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/679,529	WILSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Marivelisse Santiago-Cordero	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 August 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-18 and 20-23* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-18 and 20-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on 8/21/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant' argues that Allison et al. (Pub. No.: US 200/0003930) fails to disclose a modified address; and that the routing node does not provide a modified address on behalf of the HLR since the address retrieved form the HLR is not altered by the routing node (Remarks: page 2, 3rd full paragraph).

In response, at the outset, it is noted that the rejection is based on a combination of references. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In addition, it is noted that, as stated in the last Office action, Alperovich discloses a routing query from another network, made in response to a request from a user associated with said another network (col. 4, lines 23-28), responding to the routing query to provide a modified address which causes the text message from said another network to be directed to said message processing means for implementation of said delivery mode (col. 4, lines 29-47). Note that based o the target mobile station's location, the message is transferred to the appropriate destination MSC for delivery to the station. In addition, the last Office Action stated that Allison discloses wherein the routing query (Fig. 1, reference 1) is arranged to be intercepted by a signal processing means provided in said home network (Fig. 1, reference 100; paragraphs [0009] and

[0026]), said signal processing means then responding to the routing query on behalf of a HLR (home location register) of the home network to provide a modified address which causes the text message from said another network to be directed (Fig. 1; paragraphs [0009] and [0026]-[0027]).

Applicant argues that the routing node does not provide a modified address on behalf of the HLR since the address retrieved form the HLR is not altered by the routing node (Remarks: page 2, 3rd full paragraph). In response, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the address is not altered by the routing node) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The claim does not recite which network component is modifying the address, it only claims a signal processing means to provide a modified address, which is not the same as modifying (altering) an address.

Accordingly, Alperovich in combination with Allison does teach responding to the routing query on behalf of the HLR of the home network to provide a modified address as claimed.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir.

1992). In this case, the teaching, suggestion, or motivation to modify Alperovich with the teachings of Allison are found in the references themselves, i.e., Allison, for the advantages of providing communication between subscribers of different application-layer mobile communication protocols (Allison: Abstract). In addition, note that both references disclose delivering short message service (SMS) messages.

Furthermore, regarding independent claim 21, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., to provide a modified address) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The claim limitation is to provide an address; not a modified address as argued.

2. For the reasons stated above, the rejection is maintained. Accordingly, this Action is made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. Claims 1, 4, 10, 14-15, 17, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alperovich et al. (hereinafter "Alperovich", cited in form PTO-892, paper no. 20050725) in view of Allison et al. (hereinafter "Allison"; Pub. No.: US 2003/0003930).

Regarding claim 1, Alperovich discloses a method of controlling delivery of text messages to a subscriber in a telecommunications services apparatus (Abstract), the method comprising the steps of the subscriber (Fig. 2, reference numeral 22) making a selection as to a mode of delivery that the subscriber requires for one of (i) a future text message and (ii) a

category of future text messages (Abstract; col. 1, lines 55-57; col. 2, lines 19-23), the subscriber's requested selection being implemented by a message processing means (Fig. 2, references 200, 40, or 50, either singularly or in combination) which is part of the home network with which the subscriber's mobile telephone is normally associated (col. 1, line 63 through col. 2, line 19), the arrangement being such that any text messages intended by the sender to be delivered to the said subscriber, as intended receiver thereof, are directed to the message processing means which then implements the delivery mode previously selected by the subscriber (Fig. 2; col. 3, lines 24-66; col. 4, lines 23-36). Alperovich also discloses a routing query from another network, made in response to a request from a user associated with said another network (col. 4, lines 23-28), responding to the routing query to provide a modified address which causes the text message from said another network to be directed to said message processing means for implementation of said delivery mode (col. 4, lines 29-47).

Alperovich fails to disclose wherein the routing query is arranged to be intercepted by a signal processing means provided in said home network, said signal processing means then responding to the routing query on behalf of a HLR (home location register) of the home network.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Allison discloses wherein the routing query (Fig. 1, reference 1) is arranged to be intercepted by a signal processing means provided in said home network (Fig. 1, reference 100; paragraphs [0009] and [0026]), said signal processing means then responding to the routing query on behalf of a HLR (home location register) of the home network to provide a modified address which causes the text message from said another network to be directed (Fig. 1; paragraphs [0009] and [0026]-[0027]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to intercept the routing query of Alperovich by a signal processing means provided in said home network, said signal processing means then responding to the routing query on behalf of the HLR of Alperovich of the home network to provide a modified address which causes the text message from said another network to be directed as suggested by Allison for the advantages of providing communication between subscribers of different application-layer mobile communication protocols (Allison: Abstract).

Regarding claim 4, in the obvious combination, Allison discloses in which the signal processing means is an SMS router (paragraph [0009]).

Regarding claim 10, in the obvious combination, Alperovich discloses the method of claim 1 (see above) in which one of the delivery modes which is available is a mode providing special handling of some messages according to originator number (col. 1, lines 55-57; col. 1, line 63 through col. 2, line 9).

Regarding claim 14, Alperovich discloses the method of claim 1 (see above) in which the subscriber makes the selection by a USSD command (Abstract).

Regarding claim 15, Alperovich discloses the method of claim 1 (see above) in which the subscriber makes the selection by an SMS (from col. 5, line 67 through col. 6, line 6).

Regarding claim 17, Alperovich discloses a telecommunications network comprising a message processing means (Fig. 2, reference 200, 40, or 50, either singularly or in combination) that is capable of storing a selection of at least one selectable mode of delivery of a text message made by a subscriber to a network incorporating the message processing means (col. 2, lines 3-23) and to implement the previously selected mode of delivery on receipt by the message

processing means of a text message, intended for receipt by said subscriber, by forwarding the message to at least one delivery path of the message processing means (col. 2, lines 3-23; Fig. 5; col. 5, lines 22-50), wherein the telecommunications network further comprises a HLR (home location register) (Fig. 2, reference numeral 26), routing queries sent to the HLR of said network from another network (col. 4, lines 23-28), for receiving a text message from such another network (Fig. 2; col. 3, lines 15-66), and provide a modified address which will cause the text message from said another network to be sent to the message processing means which will then effect delivery in accordance with at least one previously selected mode of delivery (Fig. 2; col. 3, lines 45-66; col. 4, lines 29-37).

Alperovich fails to disclose a signal processing means, said signal processing means being configured in association with the HLR to intercept routing queries sent to the HLR of said network from another network, for receiving a text message from such another network, to communicate with the HLR but to provide a modified address.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Allison discloses signal processing means (Fig. 1, reference 100), said signal processing means being configured in association with the HLR to intercept routing queries sent to the HLR of said network from another network (Fig. 1; paragraphs [0009] and [0026]), for receiving a text message from such another network (Fig. 1, reference 100; paragraphs [0009] and [0026]), to communicate with the HLR but to provide a modified address (Fig. 1, reference 100; paragraphs [0009] and [0026]-[0027]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to incorporate a signal processing means, said signal processing means being configured in association with the HLR to intercept routing queries of Alperovich sent to

the HLR of said network from another network, for receiving a text message from such another network, to communicate with the HLR but to provide a modified address as suggested by Allison for the advantages of providing communication between subscribers of different application-layer mobile communication protocols (Allison: Abstract).

Regarding claim 20, in the obvious combination, Allison discloses in which the signal processing means is an SMS router (paragraph [0009]).

5. Claims 2, 5, 8-9, 11-12, 18, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alperovich in combination with Allison (hereinafter "Alperovich/Allison") as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Astrom et al. (hereinafter "Astrom"; cited in form PTO-892, paper no. 20050725).

Regarding claim 2, Alperovich/Allison discloses the method of claim 1 (see above). Alperovich/Allison fails to disclose in which the message processing means is an SMS router.

However, Astrom, in the same field of endeavor, discloses in which the message processing means is an SMS router (col. 6, lines 4-7 and 27-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to use the message processing means of Alperovich/Allison as an SMS router as suggested by Astrom for the advantages of using a structure that is already widely available and known, thereby, reducing the need to incorporate new and additional structures in the network; in addition, it would have the responsibility to determine how the messages shall be routed (Astrom: col. 6, lines 4-7).

Regarding claim 5, Alperovich/Allison disclose the method of claim 1 (see above). Alperovich/Allison fail to disclose in which one of the delivery modes which is available is a mode providing a delayed message delivery during selected hours of the day.

However, Astrom, in the same field of endeavor, discloses in which one of the delivery modes, which is available, is a mode providing a delayed message delivery during selected hours of the day (col. 3, lines 49-53; note the scheduled delivery of the message).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to provide a delayed message delivery during selected hours of the day in the delivery modes of Alperovich/Allison as suggested by Astrom for the advantage of allowing the recipient to receive the message when he/she is available or less occupied.

Regarding claim 8, Alperovich/Allison disclose the method of claim 1 (see above). Alperovich/Allison fail to disclose in which one of the delivery modes, which is available, is a mode providing diversion of messages on a time of day basis.

However, Astrom, in the same field of endeavor, discloses in which one of the delivery modes, which is available, is a mode providing diversion of messages on a time of day basis (col. 3, lines 49-53; note the scheduled delivery of the message).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to provide diversion of messages on a time of day basis in the delivery modes of Alperovich/Allison as suggested by Astrom for the advantage of allowing the recipient to receive the message when he/she is available or less occupied.

Regarding claim 9, Alperovich/Allison disclose the method of claim 1 (see above). Alperovich/Allison fail to disclose in which one of the delivery modes, which is available, is a mode providing conversion of messages to voice for delivery in a voice call.

However, Astrom, in the same field of endeavor, discloses in which one of the delivery modes, which is available, is a mode providing conversion of messages to voice for delivery in a voice call (col. 3, lines 49-53; note the media conversion).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to provide conversion of messages to voice for delivery in a voice call in one of the delivery modes of Alperovich/Allison as suggested by Astrom for the advantages of audibly notifying the recipient.

Regarding claim 11, Alperovich/Allison disclose the method of claim 1 (see above). Alperovich/Allison fail to disclose in which one of the delivery modes, which is available, is a mode providing filtering of messages by address information or content.

However, Astrom, in the same field of endeavor, discloses in which one of the delivery modes, which is available, is a mode providing filtering of messages by address information or content (col. 3, lines 53-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to provide filtering of messages by address information or content call in one of the delivery modes of Alperovich/Allison as suggested by for the advantage of screening out annoying advertisements (Astrom: col. 3, lines 53-55).

Regarding claim 12, Alperovich/Allison disclose the method of claim 1 (see above). Alperovich/Allison fail to disclose in which one of the delivery modes, which is available, is a mode providing delivery by fax.

However, Astrom, in the same field of endeavor, discloses in which one of the delivery modes, which is available, is a mode providing delivery by fax (col. 2, lines 18-23).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to provide delivery by fax in one of the delivery modes of Alperovich/Allison as suggested by Astrom for the advantage of converting the message to a desired delivery media (Astrom: col. 2, lines 18-23).

Regarding claim 18, Alperovich discloses the method of claim 17 (see above). Alperovich fails to disclose in which the message processing means is an SMS router.

However, Astrom, in the same field of endeavor, discloses in which the message processing means is an SMS router (col. 6, lines 4-7 and 27-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to use the message processing means of Alperovich/Allison as an SMS router as suggested by Astrom for the advantages of using a structure that is already widely available and known, thereby, reducing the need to incorporate new and additional structures in the network; in addition, it would have the responsibility to determine how the messages shall be routed (Astrom: col. 6, lines 4-7).

Regarding claim 22, in the obvious combination, Allison discloses in which the signal processing means is an SMS router (paragraph [0009]).

6. Claims 6-7, 9, 12-13, 16, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alperovich/Allison as applied to 1 above and further in view of Skladman et al. (hereinafter "Skladman"; cited in form PTO-892, paper no. 20050725).

Regarding claim 6, Alperovich/Allison disclose the method of claim 1 (see above). Alperovich/Allison fails to disclose in which one of the delivery modes, which is available, is a mode providing diversion of text messages to fixed line when the subscriber is in a home cell.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Skladman discloses in which one of the delivery modes which is available is a mode providing diversion of text messages to fixed line when the subscriber is in a home cell (pages 3-4; paragraph [0044]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to provide diversion of text messages to fixed line when the subscriber is in a home cell in one of the delivery modes of Alperovich/Allison as suggested by Skladman for delivering over any or all of the available communication networks, depending on the preferences of the respective users (Skladman: page 4, paragraph [0048]).

Regarding claim 7, Alperovich/Allison disclose the method of claim 1 (see above). Alperovich/Allison fail to disclose in which one of the delivery modes, which is available, is a mode providing diversion of messages to an alternative mobile number.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Skladman discloses in which one of the delivery modes, which is available, is a mode providing diversion of messages to an alternative mobile number (pages 3-4; paragraph [0044]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to provide diversion of messages to an alternative mobile number in one

of the delivery modes of Alperovich/Allison as suggested by Skladman for the advantage of delivering over any or all of the available communication networks, depending on the preferences of the respective users (Skladman: page 4, paragraph [0048]), in addition to being more convenient.

Regarding claim 9, Alperovich/Allison discloses the method of claim 1 (see above). Alperovich/Allison fails to disclose in which one of the delivery modes, which is available, is a mode providing conversion of messages to voice for delivery in a voice call.

However, Skladman discloses in which one of the delivery modes, which is available, is a mode providing conversion of messages to voice for delivery in a voice call (page 4, paragraphs [0053]-[0055]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to provide conversion of messages to voice for delivery in a voice call of Alperovich/Allison as suggested by Skladman for the advantage of audibly notifying the recipient (Skladman: page 4, paragraph [0055]).

Regarding claim 12, Alperovich/Allison disclose the method of claim 1 (see above). Alperovich/Allison fail to disclose in which one of the delivery modes, which is available, is a mode providing delivery by fax.

However, Skladman discloses in which one of the delivery modes, which is available, is a mode providing delivery by fax (pages 4-5; paragraph [0055]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to provide delivery by fax in one of the delivery modes of

Alperovich/Allison as suggested by Skladman for the advantage of converting the message to a desired delivery media.

Regarding claim 13, Alperovich/Allison disclose the method of claim 1 (see above). Alperovich/Allison fail to disclose in which one of the delivery modes, which is available, is a mode providing delivery by e-mail.

However, Skladman discloses in which one of the delivery modes, which is available, is a mode providing delivery by e-mail (pages 3-4; paragraph [0044]; pages 4-5; paragraph [0055]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to provide delivery by e-mail in one of the delivery modes of Alperovich/Allison as suggested by Skladman for the advantage of allowing the recipient to view the message wherever Internet is available.

Regarding claim 16, Alperovich/Allison disclose the method of claim 1 (see above). Alperovich/Allison fail to disclose in which the subscriber makes the selection by means of an interactive voice call.

However, Skladman discloses in which the subscriber makes the selection by means of an interactive voice call (pages 5-6, paragraph [0063]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to make the selection of Alperovich/Allison by means of an interactive voice call as suggested by Skladman for the advantage of permitting the user to enter the information, preferences and selections in a simple and efficient manner available wherever a telephone is present.

Regarding claim 23, Alperovich/Allison disclose the method of claim 1 (see above). Alperovich/Allison fail to disclose in which one of the delivery modes, which is available, is a mode providing delivery by voice call.

However, Skladman discloses in which one of the delivery modes, which is available, is a mode providing delivery by voice call (page 4, paragraph [0055]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to provide delivery of Alperovich by voice call of Alperovich as suggested by Skladman for the advantage of audibly notifying the recipient (Skladman: page 4, paragraph [0055]).

7. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allison in view of Alperovich.

Regarding claim 21, Allison discloses telecommunications services apparatus comprising a signal processing means (Fig. 1, reference 100) configured in association with a HLR (home location register) to intercept routing queries sent to the HLR of said network from another network (Fig. 1; paragraphs [0009] and [0026]), the signal processing means being configured to communicate with the HLR but to provide an address (Fig. 1; paragraphs [0009] and [0026] and [0027]) which will cause a text message from said another network to be sent to a message processing means (Fig. 1, reference 110; paragraphs [0009] and [0027]), the message processing means being operative to effect delivery (paragraph [0043]).

Allison fails to disclose effecting delivery in accordance with a mode or modes of delivery previously selected by a recipient of the message.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Alperovich discloses a telecommunications services apparatus comprising message processing means being operative to effect delivery in accordance with a mode or modes of delivery previously selected by a recipient of the message (Abstract: Fig. 2; col. 4, lines 29-36).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to effect the delivery of Allison in accordance with a mode or modes of delivery previously selected by a recipient of the message as suggested by Alperovich for the advantages of selectively accepting or rejecting short messages (Alperovich: col. 1, lines 8-11), thereby allowing the subscriber to specify from which senders text messages will be accepted or rejected (Alperovich: col. 1, lines 55-57).

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marivelisse Santiago-Cordero whose telephone number is (571) 272-7839. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30am to 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lester Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-7922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

8/31/06

MSC

LESTER G. KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER